

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION

JACOB ALAN HAROUFF,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff	:	
	:	
VS.	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 7:05-CV-101 (HL)
	:	
ASHLEY PAULK; MARK ELKINS;	:	
DWIGHT PEETE; LOWNDES	:	
COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT;	:	
LOWNDES COUNTY COMMISSION,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	<u>ORDER</u>

Plaintiff **JACOB ALAN HAROUFF**, formerly a pretrial detainee at the Lowndes County Jail in Valdosta, Georgia, filed a pro se civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on September 22, 2005. Since that time he has filed numerous motions, including a “Motion Requesting the Right to File Additional Motions” (R. at 5); “Motion to Produce (R. at 6); and “Request for Immediate Access to Legal Reference Materials” (R. at 9). For the reasons discussed below, all three of these motions are **DENIED**.

I. MOTION RESERVING THE RIGHT TO FILE ADDITIONAL MOTIONS

Plaintiff states that the “inordinate complexity of the matter brought by the plaintiff requires continuing analysis of materials provided the by the defendant which may lead to additional substantive motions” and requests the Court to allow such motions.

The Court cannot, at this time, state whether it will grant or deny any future motions filed by plaintiff. Moreover, in this litigation, plaintiff is to follow the procedure set forth in the separate Order entered this same date requesting service on defendants Ashley Paulk, Mark Elkins, and

Dwight Peete. Plaintiff's motions requesting the right to file future motions is unnecessary.

II. MOTION TO PRODUCE

Plaintiff has filed a Motion to Produce in which he requests various documents that are, presumably, in the possession of defendants. This order is premature. The discovery procedure that plaintiff is to follow in this litigation is set forth in the separate Order entered this same date requesting service on defendants Ashley Paulk, Mark Elkins, and Dwight Peete.

III. REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE ACCESS TO LEGAL REFERENCE MATERIALS

Plaintiff's claims regarding his lack of access to the law library at Lowndes County Prison are addressed in this Court's Recommendation entered this same date. Moreover, it does not appear that plaintiff is still being detained at the Lowndes County Jail. Therefore, he should have no need to use the law library at this facility.

For the reasons discussed above, these three motions are **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 31st day of March, 2006.

/s/ Richard L. Hodge
RICHARD L. HODGE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

